

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 99-7114**

---

LEONARD CARTER, JR.

Plaintiff - Appellant,

and

GREGORY HARRIS; A. PRICE; CURTIS B. WILLIAMS;  
FRANK BROWN; LEMUEL WASHINGTON; VINCENT JAMES;  
JAMES SELBY; THOMAS LOUIS DALE, JR.; LINELL R.  
JONES; RALPH HAIRSTONE; DEMETRIS ODOM,

Plaintiffs,

versus

RONALD J. ANGELONE, Director; A. D. ROBINSON,  
Warden; JOHN P. ALDERMAN, Chairman; P. W. BUCK  
ROGERS, Director; E. MONTGOMERY TUCKER, Former  
Chairman; JOHN B. METZER, III, Former Chair-  
man; M. L. HILL, Operation Officer,

Defendants - Appellees,

and

COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA,

Defendant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern  
District of Virginia, at Richmond. Richard L. Williams, Senior  
District Judge. (CA-99-112)

---

---

Submitted: October 21, 1999

Decided: October 27, 1999

---

Before WIDENER and TRAXLER, Circuit Judges, and BUTZNER, Senior  
Circuit Judge.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Leonard Carter, Appellant Pro Se.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.  
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Leonard Carter appeals from a district court order dismissing without prejudice his complaint alleging civil rights violations under 42 U.S.C.A. § 1983 (West Supp. 1999). The court dismissed Carter's complaint because he failed to pay his filing fee as directed or otherwise aver that he could not pay such a fee. Because Carter may proceed with this action in the district court by amending his complaint to provide the information requested by the court, his appeal is interlocutory and not subject to appellate review. See Domino Sugar Corp. v. Sugar Workers Local Union 392, 10 F.3d 1064, 1066-67 (4th Cir. 1993). Accordingly, we dismiss the appeal for lack of jurisdiction. We deny Carter's motions to appoint counsel, to produce documents, to proceed in forma pauperis, for summary judgment, and "for trial by jury." We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED